



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/648,767	08/28/2000	Alan F. Graves	85773-323	5709
26123	7590	06/28/2005	EXAMINER	
BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS LLP WORLD EXCHANGE PLAZA 100 QUEEN STREET SUITE 1100 OTTAWA, ON K1P 1J9 CANADA			PAYNE, DAVID C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2638	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/648,767

Applicant(s)

GRAVES, ALAN F.

Examiner

David C. Payne

Art Unit

2638

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 44-48 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26,29-43 and 49-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 27 and 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2638

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-54 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claim(s) 1-20, 39-43, 49, and 50-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petsko et al. 6292516 B1 (Petsko) in view of Tsuda US 5,619,507 (Tsuda) and Ballintine et al. US 6724996 (Ballintine).

Re claim(s) 1, 11, 8, 12, 18, 39, 43, 49, 54

Petsko disclosed

A method for communicating a packet of digital information including at least a preamble with a synchronization pattern, and a data field, see abstract.

Petsko does not disclose overhead bits in a wrapper symbol.

Petsko does not disclose wherein each wrapper symbol is characterized by a signal level transition pattern, said signal level transition pattern being either a first pattern or a second pattern depending on the logic value of the respective information bit; and wherein the first and second patterns each have a distinct average signal level and are each characterized by at least one signal level transition.

Art Unit: 2638

Tsuda disclosed that signals use unique signal levels to identify bit patterns. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that a every binary word has a distinct average signal level since the a binary symbol has bit transitions and therefore creates a dc bias based upon the time the it is off, (see Tsuda col./line: 5/60-65, 6/20-35, 6/45-55).

Ballintine disclosed overhead bits contained in a wrapper symbol, see Ballintine e.g., col./lines: 5/19-65. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to encode overhead bits in a wrapper symbol provides capacity for the optical channel overhead, it can also be employed to provide a forward error correction capability are that it is independent of the client signal type and does not degrade the client signal, see cols./line: 2/5-15.

Re claim(s) 2, 40-42,

In the modified invention to Petsko, Tsuda and Ballintine, Tsuda disclosed wherein the first and second patterns each have a plurality of signal level transitions which are sufficiently densely spaced in time to enable far-end receiver synchronization (see Tsuda col./line: 8/1-10).

Re claim(s) 3, 4, 13, 14, 20, 50-52

In the modified invention to Petsko, Tsuda and Ballintine, Tsuda does not disclose wherein the first and second patterns each have at least one rising edge and at least one falling edge. However, Tsuda disclosed that synchronization is possible at the receiver. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that bit transitions need occur for synchronization to be possible a the receiver and therefore complementary to reduce dc bias.

Re claim(s) 5, 6, 15, 16

In the modified invention to Petsko, Tsuda and Ballintine, Tsuda wherein the first pattern has multiple substantially evenly distributed pulses (Tsuda, figure 7).

Re claim(s) 7, 10, 17

Art Unit: 2638

In the modified invention to Petsko, Tsuda and Ballintine, Petsko further comprising a payload segment between each adjacent pair of wrapper bursts (test words), wherein each wrapper burst has a duration substantially less than the duration of either adjacent payload segment. (Petsko, figures 3 and 4)

Re claim(s) 9, 19

In the modified invention to Petsko, Tsuda and Ballintine disclosed being an electrical signal (Tsuda figure 1).

Re claim(s) 53

The modified invention of Petsko, Tsuda, and Ballintine disclosed Forward Error Correction (FEC), see Ballintine cols./lines: 3/10-20.

4. Claim(s) 21-26, 29, and 30-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petsko et al. US006292516B1 (Petsko) in view of Tsuda US 5,619,507 (Tsuda), Ballintine et al. US 6724996 (Ballintine) and Nakamura et al. US005857092A (Nakamura).

Re claim 21-24, 32, 38

Petsko disclosed,

A communications signal embodied in a transmission medium and for use in a communications network, comprising: recurrent wrapper bursts, each wrapper burst comprising one or more wrapper symbols (e.g., col./line: 4/1-10), each of which corresponds to an information bit;

Petsko does not disclose wherein each wrapper symbol is characterized by a signal level transition pattern, said signal level transition pattern being either a first pattern or a second pattern depending on the logic value of the respective information bit; and wherein the first and second patterns each have a distinct average signal level and are each characterized by at least one signal level transition.

Tsuda disclosed that signals have a dc balance component based upon symbol transition. It would

Art Unit: 2638

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that a every binary word has a distinct average signal level since the a binary symbol has bit transitions and therefore creates a dc bias based upon the time the it is off, (see Tsuda col./line: 5/60-65, 6/20-35, 6/45-55). Petsko dose not disclose the method comprising the steps of: converting the composite optical signal into an electrical signal having an electrical bandwidth that is substantially less than the bandwidth of the high-speed data stream; locating the position of each wrapper segment in the low-bandwidth electrical signal; and detecting Individual bits of the overhead bit stream from the average level of the low-bandwidth electrical signal during the located wrapper segments. Ballintine disclosed overhead bits contained in a wrapper symbol, see Ballintine e.g., col./lines: 5/19-65. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to encode overhead bits in a wrapper symbol provides capacity for the optical channel overhead, it can also be employed to provide a forward error correction capabillty are that it is Independent of the client signal type and does not degrade the client signal, see cols./line: 2/5-15. Nakamura disclosed optical/electrical conversion and detecting individual bits of the overhead bit stream from the average level of the low-bandwidth electrical signal during the located wrapper segments (figure 8, #153). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the wrapper symbol technology to the optical domain for the benefit of high speed transport.

Re claim(s) 25, 26, 29, 30, 34, 36

Tsuda disclosed, wherein the step of detecting comprises: for each wrapper symbol interval in each located wrapper segment, measuring an average signal level of the low bandwidth electrical signal during that wrapper symbol interval; comparing the measured average signal level to a threshold; and if the measured average signal level is above the threshold, concluding that the corresponding bit in the overhead bit stream is a logic "one" and if the measured average signal level is below the threshold, concluding that the corresponding bit in the overhead bit stream is a logic zero (e.g., col./line: 5/60-65, 6/20-35, 6/45-55).

Art Unit: 2638

Re claim(s) 31, 35

Petsko does not disclose each wrapper symbol is characterized by at least one intermediate signal level transition.

However, Tsuda disclosed that synchronization is possible at the receiver. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that bit transitions need occur for synchronization to be possible at the receiver and therefore complementary to reduce dc bias. (see Tsuda col./line: 8/1-10).

Re claim(s) 33, 37

In the modified invention to Petsko, Tsuda, Ballintine and Nakamura, Petsko disclosed wherein the receiver has a bandwidth which is significantly less than the bit rate of the high-speed data stream. (Petsko figures 3 and 4).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 44-48 are allowed.
6. Claims 27 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David C. Payne whose telephone number is (571) 272-3024. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7a-4p.

Art Unit: 2638

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Vanderpuye can be reached on (571) 272-3078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dcp


David C. Payne
Patent Examiner
AU 2638